Mr. PRESIDENT.—Within a month, if possible.

Difficulties of Sugar-cane Growers in Maddur Taluk.

Q.—8. Mr. H. K. VEERANNA GOWDA (Maddur Taluk).

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether they are aware that the raiyats growing sugar-cane in the Maddur Taluk have submitted resolutions passed at meetings held by them, from time to time during the past three years, with regard to the difficulties they are experiencing;

(*b*) and whether they have given any reply either accepting or rejecting their prayers ?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. Venkatanaranappa).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The resolutions were referred to the Sugar Company and the Departments concerned for taking such action as might be feasible.

Mr. H. K. VEERANNA GOWDA.—No definite answer has been given to question (*b*). Why is it so ?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—It is not possible to do so because the subject-matter of the resolutions passed pertains to the Sugar Company over which the Government have not the same control as they have over the commercial concerns run by Government.

Failure of Crops in Chamarajanagar Taluk.

Q.—9. Messrs. M. S. BASAVANNA DEVARU (Yelandur Jahgir); N. BHOGI MALLAIYA (Heggaddevankote Taluk); S. K. SIDDE GOWDA and S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAIYA GOWDA (Krishnarajapet Taluk); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Krishnarajanagar Taluk); K. N. PUTTANNA, SIDDAVEERAPPA and GURUBASAPPA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); M. MAYI GOWDA (T.-Narsipur Taluk); U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Mysore City Municipality); G. MALLANNA (Mysore Taluk); K. C. SUBBANNA (Gundlupet Taluk); S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk); M. SUBBIAH (Seringapatam Municipality); B. CHAMAIYA and M. SIVANANJE GOWDA (Seringapatam Taluk); K. CHIKKALINGIAH and J. DEVAIYA (Mandya Taluk) and T. MARIYAPPA (Nagamangala Taluk).

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) what are the chief tanks in the Chamarajnagar Taluk that are fed by the River Suvarnavathi;

(*b*) has it come to the notice of Government that, as a result of many obstructions to the supply of water to these tanks, there has been a failure of crops;

(*c*) is it a fact that the loss of crops under the tanks—Chikkakere of Ramasamudra, Doddakere and Sindakere—has been brought to the notice of the Government by the taluk authorities and the raiyats;

(*d*) are Government aware that these tanks are the only source of living to the raiyats of this area ?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesava Iengar).—

(*a*) (1) Ramasamudra Doddakere.
(2) Ramasamudra Chikkakere.
(3) Sindakere.
(4) Kodimole tank.
(5) Somma tank.
(6) Saragur tank.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) The raiyats under these tanks applied for grant of remission, but there was sufficient water in the tanks to raise crops and as the raiyats did not make any attempts to feed the tanks with water from Hongalavadi channel taken from the river in spite of facilities given by the Public Works Department and Revenue authorities, no remission was recommended. The average yield of crop under the tanks was between 6 annas and 8 annas.

(*d*) The question is not clear.

Mr. M. S. BASAVANNA DEVARU.—With reference to answer to (*b*), is it not a fact that many raiyats have brought all their difficulties to the notice of the Executive Engineer, the Deputy Commissioner and the Government ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—But obstruction to the supply of water was not the cause of their difficulties.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that the Sindakere and other tanks have not been receiving adequate supplies of water for the past 5 or 6 years?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Are the Government aware that because many sluices below the *nala* are open, the Ramasamudra tank a few miles off Dollipura has not been receiving adequate supply of water?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—It is not correct to think so. In fact, the Government also had thought so at first, and closed the sluices in the hope that the tank would receive adequate supplies. But that hope has not been realised yet. So we will have to see whether the situation will improve if other sluices are closed.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Prayers for the grant of remission were not complied with on the ground that the raiyats did not make use of water which was available. May I therefore ask whether the Government have enquired how much water was available?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No. The reports received by Government go to show that sufficient water was available.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Did the Deputy Commissioner hold any local inquiry before sending his report?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

The REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman).—This question had come up for discussion before this House at the last Session also. In view of that, the Chief Engineer inspected the spot. Some sluices have been closed, and the Public Works Department have taken over control over the supply of water. The matter is still engaging the attention of the department and they will do everything they can for obviating the difficulties complained of.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—This year there have been pretty good rains and the reports that may be sent up by the officers concerned may look rosy enough. But the Government must consider the difficulties felt in lean years. In view of those difficulties, is it not desirable to extend the Hongalavadi and other *nalas*?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—We will consider that question also, trying, in the meanwhile, the suggestions made by the Chief Engineer.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—BILLS.

I. General Principles of the Bill to amend the Mysore Civil Courts Regulation, I of 1883.

The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesavaiengar) explained the general principles of the bill as follows:—

The Mysore Civil Courts Regulation, I of 1883, was amended by Regulation VII of 1926 so as to make it possible to appoint more than one Subordinate Judge to a Subordinate Judge's Court and more than one Munsiff to a Munsiff's Court. On that occasion no amendment was made so that more than one District Judge could be appointed to a District Court. Whenever arrears accumulate in any District Court, it becomes necessary to establish an Additional District Court with separate establishment for temporary periods. The High Court will have to formally transfer suits and proceedings from the permanent to temporary courts and retransfer them to the permanent court when the additional court ceases to exist. Difficulties will also arise in the matter of the execution of the decrees and orders passed by the Additional Court when it is abolished. The most convenient and economical course in such circumstances would be to add a Judge temporarily to an existing District Court.

The present bill is intended to provide for the appointment, when necessary, of more than one District Judge to a District Court so as to avoid the inconveniences mentioned above.

The general principles were then put to vote and carried unanimously.

II. General Principles of the Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code as in force in Mysore.

The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesavaiengar)